



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

power from April, 1917, until the day of the armistice to lead us to believe that Germany, having spent forty years in preparation and thinking that the proper moment had arrived, struck deliberately and wantonly, and plunged Europe into bloody conflict in order to destroy her rivals, create a Central European empire, and grasp the prize of world dominion.

Now is it illogical to hold such a theory while at the same time assuming that one week's frank discussion of differences between them on the part of the European Powers would completely have disarmed Germany, altered her course, and satisfied her ambitions.

Both assumptions cannot be true. Why does Mr. Wilson attempt to lead us astray? Or does he falsify unconsciously and from force of habit? I confess that such inconsistency is a sore puzzle to me.

I believe in clear thinking and honest statement.

Newport, Ky.

T. W. RAINEY.

A WASHINGTON VIEW

SIR,—I have just read your address before the Columbian Club, and I cannot restrain the impulse to write and offer my personal thanks and congratulations.

The analysis and logic of Senators Lodge and Knox are all right for Senators, Judges, Lawyers and such folk, and will sway the citizen, if given weeks or months to germinate; but it needs the machine-gun fire of Roosevelt to reach the Man-on-the-Street and the Man-at-the-Work-bench, the Preacher, and the Church pews, and shock them into the consciousness of the fact that the President is violating his oath of office "to support the Constitution of the United States of America," in his mad chase after his Will-o-the-Wisp, and in bartering the birthright of American Independence for a mess of personal ambition. This last is for the Preachers and pseudo-Pacifists.

I want to say that T. R.'s picture is the only public man's effigy I have in my den, but if you keep on making the Columbian Club brand of Addresses, and writing editorials as heretofore, I will have to hang another alongside of it.

May the spirit of American Manhood continue to give strength to your voice, and point to your pen!

CHAS. W. FITTS.

Washington, D. C.

WHO IS FOR IT?

SIR,—The Democratic papers and, in fact, some of the Republican papers, frequently quote the number of soldiers in favor of the "League of Nations," or the number of people in favor of the "League of Nations;" but I feel sure that this is not representative of the people's feeling about the manner in which the "League of Nations" is being presented and perfected.

Of course, everyone is in favor of some kind of a "League of Nations" which will prevent war. No honest human being could be opposed to it, and when you simply ask a soldier or any other

man if he is in favor of a "League of Nations," he naturally says yes, not understanding what you mean by the question. If one would take the trouble to explain just what the present "League of Nations" means to this country, I am sure the sentiment and vote would be very different, and I believe it is to the interest of the people of the country for the newspapers to bear down on this point and to emphasize that we are all in favor of a "League of Nations," but not for one made up and dictated by foreign countries and agreed to by one man for the entire United States of America.

FRED. C. CLARKE.

Hartford, Conn.